

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

GREGORY D. PEASE,

Plaintiff,

v.

FARO TECHNOLOGIES,

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION
NO. 15-3586

ORDER

AND NOW, this 22nd day of February 2016, upon consideration of Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File an Amended Complaint (Doc. No. 17) and Defendant's Opposition (Document No. 18), and in accordance with the Opinion of the Court issued this day, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File an Amended Complaint (Doc. No. 17) is **GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART** as follows:

1. Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File an Amended Complaint as to Count I for Wrongful Discharge with Specific Intent to Harm and Count II for Wrongful Discharge in Violation of Public Policy is **DENIED**;
2. Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File an Amended Complaint as to Count III for Breach of Contract and Count IV for a violation of the Pennsylvania Wage Payment and Collection Law 43 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 260.1 et seq. is **GRANTED**;
3. Plaintiff shall file his Amended Complaint by **February 26, 2016**; and
4. Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint (Doc. No. 6) is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE AS MOOT**.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Joel H. Slomsky
JOEL H. SLOMSKY, J.